Tahqîq Ahl ul Hadîth

by
Maulânâ Habîb ur Rahmân Âzamî

ZAM ZAM PUBLISHERS

الحمدلله و كفى وسلام على عباده الذين اصطفىٰ اما بعد

Tahqîq Ahl ul Hadîth

bismillâh ir rahman ir rahîm

1 A Novel Definition of Hadîth

At the beginning of his lecture, the speaker stated that the word “Hadith” means “the word of Allâh and the word of his Rasûl.”

Comment on this:

Mawlânâ Habîb ur Rahmân points out that this is an entirely novel definition of Hadith. Up to this time, the accepted definition among the scholars of Islâm, both *muqallid* and *ghair muqallid*, has always been: “The word, action, or *taqrîr*, of the Messenger of Allâh *salallâhu alaihi wa sallam* .” (Here the word *taqrîr* means selection, confirmation, or approval of some action.”) He quotes a well-known *ghair muqallid* writer Nawâb Hasan Khân:

“Hadîth dar istilâh mash’hûr qawl o fi’l o taqrîr e rasûl ast - alaihis salât o salâm.”

“The accepted meaning of hadîth is the word action or taqrîr of the Messenger - *alaihis salât o salâm*.” Then, after referring to a less common definition which includes the word of a *sahâbî* or *tâbi’î*, he says, *“O sawab awwal ast.”*

"And the correct one is the first." *(Mask ul Khitâm p. 21)*

A very well-known *ghair muqallid* writer of that time, Maulânâ Thanâ'ullah Amritsrarî, after distinguishing between Hadîth and Qur'ân, has also written:

"In accordance with accepted principles, the Ahl ul Hadîth understand Hadîth to be secondary to Qur'ân, and, to resolve any question, after looking in the Holy Qur'ân, look first in the Hadîth." (*Ahl ul Hadîth ka Madhhab p. 79*)

2 Citing a Counterfeit Hadîth as Evidence

The speaker then put forward a claim that the name *Ahl ul Hadîth* derives from the time of the Messenger of Allâh *salallâhu alaihi wa sallam* himself, and that this name was accepted by the *Sahâbah kirâm*. In support of the first statement he quotes this hadîth:

On the Day of Qiyâmah the Ahl ul Hadîth will come with their inkwells. Allâh Almighty will say to them, "You are the Ahl ul Hadîth. Now enter Paradise."

Comment:

In point of fact this hadîth is counterfeit. Certainly the speaker would not be knowingly quoting a counterfeit hadîth, so clearly he is not aware of its status. At the same time, this raises a question. If those ulamâa of today who do not accept the principle of *taqlîd* are not in fact able to distinguish between genuine and

counterfeit hadîth, then how much right can they have to derive masâ'il directly from hadîth?

It is not only *muqallid* Ulamâa (Dhahabî, Khatîb, and Suyûtî) who classify this hadîth as counterfeit. *Ghair muqallid* ulamâa have also included it under this heading. (See *Al Fawâ'id ul Majmû'ah* by Allâmah Shawkânî, p. 30)

The verdict of *muqallid* ulamâa on this hadîth is to be found in ....*Mawzû'ah* on p. 112

قال الخطيب موضوع (الى) قال في الميزان وضع هذا الحديث على الطبراني.

Khatîb has said that this hadîth is counterfeit..........in Al Mîzân (Raqqî) has said that this hadîth was falsely attributed to Tibrânî."

3. The Actual Meaning of "Ahl ul Hadîth"

Even if for the sake of argument,this hadîth was not counterfeit, still it would not support the speaker's claim. The term *as'hâb ul hadîth* that is used here does not refer to people who abandon *taqlîd* and claim to be practising direct on Hadîth. What it refers to, is those scholars who specialise in the writing down and teaching of Hadîth. This is clearly proved by the words

(بايديهم المحابر)

"bi aydîhim ul mahâbir." Coming forward with inkwells in their hands can only refer to people whose occupation is writing. This is also proved by the fact that this counterfeit hadîth is also found with these words:

يحشر الله اصحاب الحديث واهل العلم

"Allâh Almighty will gather together the people of hadîth and 'ilm." (*La'âlî Masnû'ah* p.13)

When the *"as'hâb ul hadîth"* are here referred to together with the *ahl ul 'ilm,* then clearly *"as'hâb ul hadîth* refers to the scholars of hadith and to those who record them and teach them.

The third proof is in the remaining words of this hadîth which for some reason the speaker leaves out in his quotation.

(طالما كنتم تصلون على نبي فى الدنيا)

That is to say, Allâh Almighty will send the *as'hâb ul hadîth* to Paradise saying to them, "you read an great amount of *durûd* on my Messenger."

This again points clearly to those who write and read hadîth because every time they read the name of the Messenger of Allâh they will write or say "*sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam.*" From this it is clear that the reason for their being given a place in Paradise is not abandoning *taqlîd*, but reciting a great amount of *durûd*. The speaker would also be aware of whether reciting *durûd* in great amounts was a practice of *muqallidîn* or *ghair muqallidîn*.

The sense in which M. Habîb ur Rahman takes the term *as'hâb ul hadîth* is also evident from what Imâm Dhahhabî says, because he has classified this hadîth under the heading

(حديث في حشر العلماء بالمحابر)

"Summoning of the Ulamâa with their Inkwells." (See *Dhahhabî: Al Mîzân.)*

4 The Meaning of the *Sahâbah* Being Ahl ul Hadîth

To support his contention that the *Sahâbah raziyallâhu 'anhum* regarded themselves as *"ahl ul hadîth"*, the speaker presents several quotations. However, in all these quotations the term *as'hâb ul hadîth* in fact means those people who reported hadîth, or memorised them or taught them, or wrote them down. In none of them can it be understood to mean those people who do not follow any imâm, or claim to act directly on the basis of hadîth.

In one place he quotes Abû Hurairah *raziyallâhu 'anhu* as saying that he was *"ahl ul hadîth."* Unfortunately, he does not quote the full background to this, otherwise it would be quite clear that Abû Hurairah *raziyallâhu 'anhu* meant by this. The reference that the speaker quotes is from *Târîkh Khatîb* and *Tadhkirah*. Here a dream seen by Abû Bak-r bin Abî Dâwûd is described:

> During the time when Abû Bak-r bin Abî Dâwûd was engaged in writing down the hadîth of Abû Hurairah *raziyallâhu 'anhu*, he saw Abû Hurairah *raziyallâhu 'anhu* in a dream. He had a thick beard, a wheaten complexion, and was wearing coarse cloth. Abû Bak-r says. "When I saw him, I

said to him, I like you very much." He replied, "I am the first *sâhib ul hadîth* in the world."

If the definition of *Sâhib ul Hadîth* that the speaker puts forward is valid, then we would have to accept that there was no Sahâbî before Abu Hurairah who practised on Hadîth. Clearly the speaker would not be so bold as to say this, so it must mean something other than what he has taken it to mean. Here it clearly means a person who is engaged in reporting and memorising hadîth. There can be no doubt that among the *Sahâbah*, Abû Hurairah *raziyallâhu 'anhu* was foremost both in his dedication to memorising hadîth, and in the number of hadîth that he transmitted. This point is also clearly confirmed by the fact that this dream is reported at a time when the person who saw it was engaged in writing down hadîth, and not in relation to some person turning rejecting *taqlîd*, or trying to practise directly on a Hadîth.

5 Citing First a Counterfeit Hadîth and then a Dream

Then the point remains that this quotation from Abû Hurairah *raziyallâhu 'anhu* was not something that he said during his lifetime. It was something that was said in a dream seen by someone several hundred years after he died. Now if a scholar has to resort to a counterfeit hadîth, and then to words said in a dream, to make his case, then clearly the evidence at his disposal cannot be very strong.

6 Further Citations

The speaker then refers to a number of Tâbi'în and quotes the phrase:

شرف اصحاب الحديث

applied to them.

Comment:

Here again he is claiming that they were *"Ahl ul Hadîth"* in the sense that he uses. Again this is not valid. The phrase

شرف اصحاب الحديث

refers to their havíng an honoured and leading position as *muhaddithîn* and as transmittters of hadîth, and the term *"as'hâb ul hadîth"* or *"ahl ul hadîth"* means simply *muhaddithîn* or transmitters of hadîth. The speaker of the book from which he is quoting himself writes:

(قد ذكرنا في كتا بنا هذا من فضل الحديث واهله المخصو صين بحفظه ونقله)

"In this book we have spoken of the *fazl* of the hadîth, and of the *ahl ul hadîth*, who have specialised in memorising and recording them." (p 134)

In this book there are also hundreds of other instances that prove this point. Among them is a section on "the *as'hâb ul hadîth* as the *khalîfahs* of the Messenger of Allâh *sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam*." Under this heading the speaker quotes this hadîth:

> Huzûr *sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam* was asked, "Who are your successors?" He said, "Those

> people who will come after me and will report my hadîth and my *sunnah*, and teach it to the people."(p.31)

Here it is perfectly clear that *as'hâb ul hadîth* refers to the people who report and teach hadîth. Another section is called "*Huzûr sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam* leaving instructions that the *as'hâb ul hadîth* are to be received with honour." Under this heading, this hadîth is quoted:

> Some young people will come from different parts of the world to learn hadîth. Treat them well. (p. 21)

From this it is clear that students of hadîth are *"as'hâb ul hadîth."* Here also Abu Sa'îd Khudrî *raziyallâhu 'anhu* is quoted, and The speaker uses that quotation on p.3 of his lecture. However, he has not presented the full quotation.

> "When he saw them he said, "Welcome!" and said, "Huzûr sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam told us to make a place for you in our gatherings, and to teach and explain his hadîth to you. You are his successors and the *ahl ul hadîth* (i.e. *muhaddithîn*) after us"

Another section is entitled, "Dreams of the Sâlihîn about the *as'hâb ul hadîth*. Under this heading one dream is as follows:

> A certain person was studying hadîth, and died

> while still studying. Abu B*k-rah bin B*k-rawî saw him in a dream. He asked him, "What happened?" He said, "I was forgiven." He asked, "What was the reason?" He said, "Because I was studying hadîth." (p. 111)

Here again the person studying hadîth is categorised under the heading *"as'hâb ul hadîth."* Other similar dreams are recounted. These examples are only a handful out of a sack.

On top of this, M. Muhammad Sâhib Jûnâgad'hî, who is *ghair muqallid,* in translating this book himself translates *"as'hâb ul hadîth"* as "students of hadîth" or as "people with a knowledge of hadith". In one place he translates

(رجل من اصحاب الحديث)

as "a student of hadîth", and in another place *"as'hâb ul hadîth"* is translated as "scholars of hadîth" (p. 33) or as "*muhaddithîn*". On p. 38 *"ahl ul hadîth"* is translated as "*muhaddithîn*", and on p 24 *as'hâb ul hadîth* is also translated as *"muhaddithîn."*

This is part of a general tendency in *Ahl-e-hadîth* writers. When the phrase *"as'hâb ul hadîth"* is used as a term of honour, they translate it as "the Ahl ul Hadîth," but, whenever some evil is referred to, they translate it as "students of hadîth", or else use some roundabout expression like "such people."

Thus M. Muhammad Jûnâgad'hî translates

(ما قوم خير من اصحاب الحديث)

as "There are no people better than the *Ahl-e-hadith*."However, on p.33 he translates

اماترى اهل الحديث كيف تغيروا كيف افسدوا

as "see how these students of hadîth have become corrupted."

In the same way, in Sharfu As'hâbi'l Hadîth, whenever the *îmân* of the "ashâb ul hadîth, or their being *abdâls* is mentioned, he translates it as "the *Ahl-e-hadîth*" or "the Jamâ'ah of the *Ahl-e-Hadîth*." (see p 18,32,34, etc) However, the statement of Imâm A'mash

(قول مافى الدنيا قوم شر من اصحاب الحديث)

is translated as, "there are no people in the world worse than these people." According to his rule he should translate it as, " there are no people in the world worse than the *Ahl-e-Hadîth*."

Similarly, another statement of Imâm A'mash:

(قول لو كانت لى اكلب كنت ارسلتها على اصحاب الحديث)

is translated as "If I had dogs, I would set them on these people." (p. 104) By his rule it should read, "If I had dogs I would set them on the *Ahl ul Hadîth*."

Similarly,

(نظر عبيد الله بن عمر الى اصحاب الحديث وزحامهم فقال شنتم العلم

وذهبتم بنوره لو ادركنا واياكم عمر بن الخطاب لا وجعنا ضرباً)

is translated as, " Ubaidullâh bin Umar, on seeing the pushing and jostling of people like these, said, "You have torn learning to pieces ...."" (p. 94). By his rule it should read, "Ubaidullâh bin 'Umar, on

seeing the pushing and jostling of the *Ahl-e-Hadîth*, said, "You have torn learning to pieces(1) and destroyed the light of knowledge. If Sayyidinâ 'Umar was here he would have punished us severely (2).""

(Note: Here only the translation of *As'hâb ul Hadîth* has been corrected. Apart from this, to translate *"shanittum"* (1)as "you have torn to pieces," and *"awja'nâ zarban"* (2) as "he would have punished us severely" is a somewhat original translation. A correct translation would be "you have disfigured," and "he would have hit us hard."

Similarly

(سمعت الليث بن سعد يقول وقد اشرف على اصحاب الحديث فرأى منهم شيئا فقال ما هذا انتم الى يسير من الادب احوج منكم الى كبير من العلم)

is translated as "I heard Laith bin Sa'd, on seeing the behaviour of people like this, say "You are more in need of a little bit of manners and actual practice than of a great amount of knowledge."" (p. 94), whereas he should have translated it as "I heard Laith bin Sa'd, on seeing the behaviour of the *Ahl-e-hadîth*, say "You are more in need of a little bit of manners and actual practice than of a great amount of knowledge.""

Abû Bak-r bin Uthmân says

(اصحاب الحديث هم شر الخلق هم المجان)

M. Muhammad Sb. translates this as, "The As'hab ul Hadîth are very bad people, indeed they are insane." (p.110) whereas he should have said, ""The *Ahl-e-*

Hadith are the worst of people, ...”
In the same way

(كان له كلب يوذي اصحاب الحديث)

is translated as “his dog used to used to attack us”, (p. 107) but should have been translated, “”Imâm A'mash's dog used to used to attack the *Ahl-e-Hadîth*”,

On p. 55 M. Muhammad translates *wa ahluhu* as “the *Ahl-e-Hadîth*,” but then translates

(يريد شعبته ان اهله يضيعون العمل بما يسمعون منه)

as “Shu'bah is referring to those people who hear a hadîth but do not practise on it.” (p. 84) This is a completely wrong translation. He should have written, ” What Shu'bah means is that the *ahl ul hadîth* do put into practice what they hear.”

(In these passages where the “ahl ul hadîth” are severely criticised presumably refer to the people of that time who used to come regularly to attend public lessons on hadîth without actually bringing religion into their lives. This needs to be checked.)

In trying to establish that the *Sahâbah* were *Ahl-e-hadîth*, the speaker also refers to *Târîkh Baghdâd* and writes that here Abdullah bin Abbâs raziyallâhu ‘anhu was described as being *Ahl-e-hadîth*. (p. 5) Unfortunately, he has not quoted the actual passage, otherwise it would be quite clear in what sense Abdullâh bin Abbâs is described as being *ahl ul hadîth*. This is the passage in question:

(اصحاب الحديث ثلثه عبدالله بن عباس فى زمانه والشعبي فى زمانه ، والثورى فى زمانه)

"There are three *as'hâb ul hadîth* : Abdullâh bin Abbas in his time, Sha'bî in his time and Thawrî in his time." If we were to take the term *ahl ul hadîth* to mean what the speaker says it means, then this means that from the time of Abdullâh bin Abbâs right up to the time of Sufyân Thawrî, there were only three *Ahl-e-Hadîth*. In this case his statement on page 5 that all the *Sahâbah* and Tâbi'în were *Ahl-e-Hadîth* has to be wrong.

In this connection he also says that "Imâm Sha'bî says that all the *Sahâbah* were *Ahl-e-Hadîth*. (p.5) Here he gives Tadhkirat ul Huffâdh v.1 p. 72as a reference. However, there is no such passage either on this page, or in the next 20 pages.

He also says that all the lands that the *Sahâbah raziyallâhu 'anhum* conquered, the people there, after coming into Islâm, followed the *madhhab* of the *Ahl-e-Hadîth*. (p. 5) One question that immediately arises is how does this prove that the *Sahâbah* were *Ahl-e-Hadîth*? Why then has this been put under the heading of "*Sahâbah Kirâm*"? Are the new Muslims of the places conquered by the *Sahâbah* also to be regarded as *Sahâbah*?

Secondly, this statement is nowhere to be found in the book that has been quoted in support of this contention. A passage has been quoted, but it has been distorted, and he has also not had the courage to translate it. If he did, it would become clear that, even after careful tailoring, the most that can be derived from this passage is that, at the time the book

was written, all the Muslims of Rûm, Jazîrah, Syria, and the borders of Azerbaijân were Ahl ul Hadîth. Nowhere is there any mention of what time is referred to, whether it was from the time of accepting Islâm and the conquests of the *Sahâbah*, or whether it was at some later period. (1)

(1) There is no mention whatever in In Usûl ud Dîn of either the word Sahâbah or of their conquering any country. However regardless of this, quoting the name of this book, he repeatedly states that from the time the sahâbah conquered these countries, their people have been Ahl-e-Hadîth. Thus on page 10 he says, "On the authority of Usûl ud Dîn you have already been informed that right from the time the Khilâfat of Uthmân, when Ifriqîyah was conquered by Sahâbah and Tâbi'în, the people of that region have been following the madhab of the Ahl-e-Hadîth." In fact in Usûl ud Dîn there is no mention of the Khilâfat of Uthmân, nor of the conquest of Ifriqîyah, nor of the people there being Ahl e- Hadîth from that time.

(بیان هذا واضح ، فی شغور الروم والجزیرة وثغور الشام وثغور

آزر بیجان وباب الابواب كلهم على مذهب اهل الحديث من اهل السنة)

"Bring your proofs if what you say is true."

Secondly, the passage in Usûl ud Dîn is not as he quotes. He has made amendments to it. The original passage is as follows:

(هاتو ابراهانكم ان كنتم صادقين)

the text as quoted is:

(على مذهب اهل الحديث)

In quoting these words the speaker has added the word *"kanû" after "kulluhum" and the phrase "min ahlis sunnah"* after

"alâ madhhabi ahl ul hadîth" has disappeared. If these adjustments had not been made to the text, then it would simply establish that the people of these places at the time of writing were *"ahl ul hadîth"*, but not that they had been *"ahl ul hadîth"*prior to that. The original passage was written in the 5th century Hijrî. So what is established from this is that in the 5th century, the people of these frontier areas were *"ahl ul hadîth"*. Secondly, it becomes clear that by "ahl ul hadîth" what is meant is that they were *ahl us sunnah*, not that they were *ghair muqallid.*

Also, if before quoting this passage the speaker had looked more carefully to see under what heading this passage occurs, he would have seen that the point at issue was to establish that the people of Thawr were *Sunnî*, not *Râfizî, Khârijî, Mu'tazilah*, and so on. The chapter heading is :

(فى تحقيق اهل السنة لاهل الثغور)

"Establishing that the people of Thawr are from the Ahl us Sunnah"

7 The Tâbi'în and Atibbâ'ut Tabi'în

In maintaining that the Tâbi'în and Atibbâ'ut Tabi'în were Ahl ul Hadîth, he has written:
"Sufyân bin Aymînah has legally been counted among

the Ahl ul Hadîth." (p. 6), and in support of this quotes Târîkh Baghdâdî v.9 p 79. Unfortunately, on this page this passage is not to be found. However, on his page there is a story of the "ahl ul hadîth" stealing shoes. The passage is as follows:

(سرق اصحاب الحديث نعل ابى زيد فكان اذاجاء اصحاب

الشعراء والعربية والاخبار رمى بثيابه ولم يتفقدها

واذاجاء اصحاب الحديث جمعها وجعلها بين يديه)

The *ahl ul hadîth* stole the shoes of Abu Zaid, so after that, whenever the *as'hâb us shu'arâa* or the *as'hâb ul arabîyah* or the *as'hâb ul akhbâr* came, he would throw his clothes down without checking on them, and when the as'hâb ul hadîth came, he would gather them and keep them in front of him. (Târîkh Baghdâd v.9 p.79)

What is actually referred to here are the students of different classes - Arab poets, arabic language, *akhbâr*, and *hadîth*.

The point then is that when Ibn 'Aymînah, or anyone else is referred to as ahl ul hadîth, it means that he was a person who had studied Hadîth and was working in that field, as I have explained earlier.

7 The Four Imâms

After this the speaker tries to maintain that the four Imâms were "ahl-e-hadîth" like himself. First of all he refers to Imâm Abû Hanîfah *rahimahullâh*, and quotes the following passage from Usûl ud Dîn:

(اصل ابی حنیفه في الکلام کا صول اصحاب الحدیث)

The passage quoted is correct, but the translation he has made is shows a considerable lack of integrity. The translation he presents is

> "The principles of Abû Hanîfah in respect of *Aqâ'id* and the prohibition of *taqlîd* (following another scholar) are the same as those of the Ahl ul Hadîth."(Usûl ud Dîn p.6)

Scholars may take note how in translating *"kalâm"* he has simply added "and the prohibition of *taqlîd*." He does not seem to have understood that the subject of the book "Usûl ud Dîn" is *Aqâ'id Kalâmîyah*. At the beginning of the book the author has counted and listed 15 principles of *Aqâ'id Kalâmîyah*, and in this list there is no mention whatsoever of "prohibiting *taqlîd*." Therefore in adding "and the prohibition of *taqlîd*." what is the speaker doing other than ascribing his own views to the author he is quoting? At the beginning of the book he author has set out the principles of the *as'hâb ul hadîth* on Aqâ'id in outline, and then in detail in the rest of the book. If the speaker here was asked to search the book and find something to say that prohibition of *taqlîd* was one of these principles, he would not be able to do so. Indeed why should there be any mention of this here? The thing that he is talking about is *taqlîd* in questions relating to particulars of religion, and the subject of the book is basic tenets.

As well as this it should be understood that when the author of Usûl ud Dîn refers to *as'hâb ul hadîth* or *ahl ul hadîth*, he is not referring to people who do not

accept taqlîd. In several places he quotes the followers (*muqallidîn*) of Imâm Shâfiî' as examples of *as'hâb ul hadîth* or *ahl ul hadîth*. For example on page 204 he refers to Abdullâh bin Sa'îd and Karâbîsî as *mutakallimîn* of the *ahl ul hadîth*, and they are both *muqallidîn* of Imâm Shâfi'î. (see *Tabaqât ush Shâfi'îyah*.) In *Lisân ul Mîzân*, Hâfiz Ibn Hajr has referred to both as being "Shâfi'î *fuqahâa*."

In this context the speaker has also quoted this statement of Ibn Aymînah, "In the first place it was Abu Hanîfah himself who made me Ahl ul Hadîth." This again means "The first person who made me a muhaddith was Abû Hanîfah himself."

The quotation is taken from Târîkh Khalqân (v. 1 p. 211) The actual Arabic text uses the word "muhaddith", and the speaker has translated it into Urdû as "Ahl-e-Hadîth." So, instead of rewriting this statement and giving it his own meaning, he should have explained that it mean that Abû Hanîfah was a muhaddith, and used to train other people (even people like Sufyân bin Aymînah) to become muhaddithîn.

After this, in a similar manner, passages are presented relating to the remaining Imâms. There is then no need to go into discussing each one separately. However, there is one question that needs to be asked. When all the four Imâms were muhaddithîn, and based all their judgements and decisions on Hadîth, - in other words were doing what the speaker says should be done - then what is the need for establishing another group to come along and do the same thing? Are those

people who came after them, and accepted and followed their system, not Ahl-e-Hadîth already? So, if they are, and most certainly they are, then what does establishing another group achieve other than *tafrîq bayna'l muslimîn* (creating division between the Mulims) ?

Another question that needs to be asked is this. When the term ahl ul hadîth is used about the four imâms, the speaker quotes it and puts great stress on it. However when the same term is used about the fuqahâa, ahl-e-fiqh, or imams of fiq'h, no mention is made of it. For example in Usûl ud Dîn on p.312, a few lines before the passage he has quoted is this statement:

(ومن بعدهم ائمة الامة فى الفقه مثل الاوزاعي ومالك والثورى

والشافعى وابي ثوروا حمد بن حبنل .الخ)

"and after them the imâms of the Ummah, such as Awzâ'î and Mâlik and Thawrî and Shâfiî' and ibn Thawr and Ahmad bin Hanbal ...."

He also refers to the hadîth:

(لاتزال طائفة من امتي منصورين)

"One section from my followers will always have the help of Allâh with them." When Imâm Ahmad bin Hanbal being asked who this group was, he said, " The Ahl-ul-Hadîth."(p.7) Here the speaker has failed to take note of what is written in the most *sahîh* Kitâb after the Kitâbullâh, (that is to say Bukhârî Sharîf) otherwise he would have seen that the heading under

which this hadîth is placed is

(لاتزال طائفة من امتى ظاهرين على الحق، وهم اهل العلم)

"One section of my Ummah will always stand up on the tuth, and those are the *ahl ul 'ilm*" (See Bukhârî v. 2 p. 108)

7 Muhammad bin Abd ul Wahhâb

After this the speaker quotes the words of Shaikh Muhammad bin Abd ul Wahhâb Najdî "The sign of the *Ahl ul Bid'ah* is that they speak ill of the *Ahl ul Hadîth*." The point that needs to be noted here is that at the same time as saying this, he was himself a Hanbalî. As noted by the *ghair muqallid* writer and leader, Nawâb Siddîq Hasan Sâhib, in "Misk ul Makhûm."(p. 14) *"mash'hûr or muqarar ân ast keh îshân hanbalî madh'hab and o dhik-r dar hanâbilah wâqi'ast."* "It is well known and clearly established that he followed the Hanbalî madh'hab, and he is also referred to as such by the Hanbalîs."

Furthermore, by Ahl ul Hadîth he means all the Ahl us Sunnah. Thus Maulâmâ Yûsuf Jaipûrî "(in *Haqîqat ul Fiqh* p. 11) quotes a passage from the same book that is quoted here (i.e. Ghunyat ut Tâlibîn)

(اهل السنة ولا اسم لهم الا اسم واحد وهو اصحاب الحديث) (اهل السنة)

"....the ahl us sunnah, and they have only one name, that is *ahl ul hadîth*."

From this it is clear that the speakers own mentor uses the term *ahl ul hadîth* to mean *ahl us sunnah*. The speaker has even quoted this statement. However, he has left out the words *"ahl us sunnah"* from the

beginning of the sentence.

7 Afghânistân

The speaker then takes great pleasure in quoting a passage from *"Farishtah"* to the effect that one of the scholars in the circle of Imâm Ghazzâlî, Abu Tayyib Suhail (this should actually be Sahl) bin Muhammad Sulaimân Sa'lûkî, was Ahl ul Hadîth. However if we look at Sa'mânî 's "Insâb" or Sabkî's "Tabaqât" (v.3 p. 169) we will see that Abû Tayyib was a muqallid of the Shafi'î school. He is referred to here as Ahl ul Hadîth in the sense that the Mâlikîs and Shâfîs are referred to as Ahl ul Hadîth. (See the *Muqaddamah* of Ibn Khaldûn p. 374, 375) In the region of Khurasân, when people use the term *Ahl ul Hadîth*, they mean specifically the Shâfi'î school, and nothing else, as ibn Islâh and Sabkî have pointed out:

(ذلك اصطلاح اهل خراسان اذا اطلقوا اصحاب الحديث يعنون الشافعية)

"This is in the terminology of the people of Khurasân. When they refer to the *Ahl ul Hadîth* they mean the Shâfi'îs." (*Tabaqât* of Sabkî v. 3 p. 258)

(اذا اطلق اهل الحديث لايراد غير الشافعية)

"When they refer to the *Ahl ul Hadîth* they do not mean anything other than Shâfi'îs." (*Tabaqât* of Sabkî v. 3 p. 259)

After this, the following assertion is put forward:

"The appointment of an Ahl ul Hadîth 'âlim as ambassador may date from the time when Sultân Mahmoud Ghaznawî, as a result of the company of

the famous Ahl ul Hadîth scholar, Qaffâl Ma'ûnî, had abandoned the Hanafî *madhhab*."(p.8)

There are a number of points to be noted here.

1 Qaffâl Maûnî has been described as *Ahl ul Hadîth*. In point of fact he was a very strict Shâfi'î. (see tabaqât Shâfi'îyah v.3 p.198.)

2 This relates to a story about Qaffâl Marûnî, which is known to be fictitious. He repeats it even though both in terms of reason and documentary evidence, it is clearly false. For detail on this is to be found in booklets by Mullâ Alî Qârî and Mullâ Abd un Nabî Gangohî. Mawlânâ Habîb ur Rahmân also refers to his own booklet on the subject, *"Makhâ'il ul ifti'âl 'alâ salawât il qaffâl"*.

3 He says that Sultân Mahmoud Ghaznawî became disaffected with Hanafî fiqh. This is contradicted by the fact that Mas'ûd bin Shaibah and Abd ul Qâdir Quraishî have included Sultân Mahmûd among the Hanafî Fuqahâa, and also for a long time a book by the Sultân entitled *"Tafrîd"* was well known and widely circulated. As well as this, right to the end of the Sultân's rule, his Qâzî ul Qazâ (Chief Justice) Abû Muhammad Nâsihî was Hanafî. This is reported in *"Jawâhir Mazîyah."*

4 If appointing an "Ahl ul Hadîth" as ambassador is an indication of dissatisfaction with Hanafî

fiqh, then what about the fact that 23 years after this, in 412 A.H. he appointed Abû Muhammad Nâsihî, who was his Qâzî ul Qazâ, as Amîr of Hajj, and that it was through the agency of this Hanafî elder, that he re-established the Hajj? (Because of the violence and depradations of the Qarâmatah - a sect of the Shî'ah - the Hajj had been stopped for many years.) Is this then not a public announcement of the superiority of the Hanafî *madhhab*? The surprising thing is that this is reported in the very same history *(Farishtah, v.1, p.46)* from which the speaker has quoted.

7 Hindustan

The same thing also applies to the speaker's contention that at the time of Bashârî, the majority of the population of Mansûrah in Sindh was Ahl ul Hadîth. What Ibn Khaldûn says makes it clear that the Shâfi'î were referred to as Ahl ul Hadîth. So he still has to produce evidence to show that they were *ghair muqallid*, and not Shâfi'î.

7 The Distribution of the Schools

The natural spread of the four schools of Fiqh into different parts of the world is dismissed contemptuously by the speaker as *"mulkî batwârah"* (sharing out countries). One answer to that would be to quote the âyat

موتوا بغيظكم

"Go die of your own rage."

A point to note here is that Qaffâl, Kabîr Shâshî, 'Abdân Marûnî, and Abû 'Awânah Isfrâ'înî are people he quotes as leading figures of the Ahl ul Hadîth. So how can we explain the efforts that they made to establish *taqlîd* of the Shâfi"î *madhhab*?

7 Government Force

The speaker follows certain of his predecessors in alleging that *taqlîd* was established at sword-point. However, simply repeating what a person's teachers have said is not proof of anything. Neither the speaker nor his predecessors have yet put forward any evidence that any government anywhere forced anyone or even told anyone that they had to become Hanafî or Mâlikî.

The only *madhhab* that has been spread at sword-point is the speaker's own *madhhab* of the Ahl ul Hadîth. He himself states.

"Yûsuf bin 'Abd ul Mu'min, then after him, his son Ya'qûb, ...fully supported the Ahl ul Hadîth madhhab. .....The Khalîfah (Ya'qûb) gave orders to abandon fiqh ..... and not follow any imâm." (p. 11)

According to the speaker, Yûsuf and his son Ya'qûb were "Ahl ul Hadîth."

So these North African kings used their royal power to ban *taqlîd*. Indeed, on page 11 he also states that Yûsuf placed his sword in front of people and said

that everything other than the Holy Qurâ'n and the Sunan of Abû Dâwûd was invalid. In other words, he threatened people with a sword to get them to accept this. On this same page he also refers to giving presents, in other words using financial inducements, to spread the Ahl ul Hadîth madhhab. He then states that this is the reason for the Ulamâa of that region being strict Ahl ul Hadîth, and as an example quotes the name of Imâm Ibn Jazm.

In this matter M. Habîb ur Rahmân fully agrees with the speaker. Similarly, every person in India who has seen the way in which people changed their *madhab* as a result of the inducements and intimidation of Nawâb Siddîq Hasan Khân, and then seen the repetition of those events in Meo and Banaras, will also have to agree.

7 "Madhhabî 'Asabîyat"

Under this heading the speaker says,

> "If a follower of one madhhab leaves his madhhab and joins another, then he became liable to punishment."

Then, under the heading of "Persecution of the Ahl ul Hadîth", he says that one person left the Hanafî madhhab and started to do *rafa' yadain* and *qirâ'at khalfa'l imâm*. He was then lashed publicly.

Here the speaker claims that this is the Hanafî ruling

on this matter. At the same time, one of his own party, Mawlânâ Muhammad Jûnâgad'hî in *"Aqîdah Muhammadî"*, quoting the *Sharh* of Durr-e-Mukhtâr which is generally known as *Shâmî*, says that the Hanafî ruling is as follows:

> "If a person today makes his salât in accordance with one madhhab (say Hanafî - that is without saying *âmîn* audibly, or raising his hands before *rukû'*, or reciting *Sûrah Fâtihah* behind the imâm) and then, the following day, makes it in accordance with another madhhab (say Shâfi'î - saying *âmîn* audibly, raising his hands before *rukû'*, and reciting *Sûrah Fâtihah* behind the imâm), it is not prohibited for him to do so."

So, the question then arises which one of the two is correct, himself or Mawlânâ Muhammad.

In point of fact, there the speaker is misquoting and misrepresenting his source. In the first place, the passage on

(ارتحل الى مذهب الشافعي)

which he quotes is from the commentary on the *sharh* of Shâmî. What 'Allâmâ Shâmî himself wrote, he has simply ignored. For the benefit of the reader, what Shâmî himself says is that a person who leaves, say, the Hanafî *madhhab* and takes up the Shâfi'î *madhhab*, will not be punished for doing so if he is not doing it for some reason that is prohibited or not acceptable in Sharî'ah, such as carnal appetite or

some worldly motive, but is doing it because he has the capacity for *ijtihâd*, and as a result of his *ijtihâd* he has come to the conclusion that a certain view is correct, and has therefore adopted it. Such a person is in no way punishable.

The conclusion of this is that the Hanafî fuqahâa have not defined leaving one madhhab for another as a punishable offence out of *'asabîyat*. This applies only to a person who is doing this out of carnal desire or for some corrupt motive, and is therefore making a mockery of the madhhabs. All this is made quite clear in the place from which he is quoting. The same will apply to a person who changes from Shâfi'î to Hanafî for these motives, and this is also made clear in the same place.

It would be interesting to know from which âyat of the Holy Qurâ'n or which hadîth the speaker derives permission for misrepresentation like this.

15 "Persecution of the Ahl ul Hadîth"

Under this heading the speaker says:

> "Abû Hafs Hanafî prohibited the compliler of the Hadîth of the Messenger, Imâm Bukhârî, from giving fatwâ in Bukhârâ, and then had him expelled him from the city." (p.12)

In the incident in question, accusing Abû Hafs of having him expelled from the city is blatant false

accusation, and to quote *Jawâhir Mazîyah* in support of this is blatant false attribution. All it says in this book is that Abu Hafs said to Imâm Bukhârî that he should not give fatwâ because that was not his field. (This was said by way of advice, and he had the right to say this because in terms of age Imâm Bukhârî was like his son, and in terms of learning, they were companions in the same class.) Further on what is stated in *Jawâhir Mazîyah* is that Imâm Bukhârî did not acccept this advice, and continued giving fatwâs, until someone asked a fatwâ and the answer he gave was wrong. The error was extremely clear. As a result the people there forced him to leave. It had nothing to do with Abû Hafs.

Further (p.15) on the same accusation is repeated. Together with this he says that the fatwâ that Imâm Bukhârî gave was not wrong, and that Abû Hafs Kabîr has falsely ascribed it to him. In support of this he quotes *Fawâ'id Buhaiyah*. However, this book does not say what he says. On the contrary it says exactly what is said in *Jawâhir Mazîyah*. This is what each of these books say, together with translation:

(قدم محمد بن اسماعيل البخارى في زمن ابي حفص الكبير
وجعل يفتى فنهاه ابو حفص وقال لست باهل له فلم ينته
حتى سئل عن صبيين شربا من لبن شاة او بقرة فافتى بثبوت الحرمة
فاجتمع الناس عليه واخرجوه من بخارى)

Muhammad bin Ismâ'îl Bukhârî came to

> Bukhârâ during the time of Abû Hafs Kabîr, and began to give fatâwâ. Abû Hafs then told him not to do so, saying to him that he was not his field. He did not stop doing so, until he was asked about two children who had drunk the milk of the same sheep or cow, and he gave a fatwâ of *hurmat* beteween them. (i.e. he said that they cannot marry each other.) The result of this was that the people united against him and expelled him from Bukhârâ. (*Jawâhir* v.1 p.7, quoted in *Fawâ 'id* p.18)

There is also more to this issue. In Nishapûr there was an âlim named Muhammad bin Yahyâ Dhahlî, who was what the speaker would term a great and famous scholar of the Ahl ul Hadîth. A dispute arose between him and Imâm Bukhârî over some question. As a result he became extremely hostile to Imâm Bukhârî, and even started calling him a bid'atî, and announced that whoever went to him should not come into his company, and that as long as he was there, Imâm Bukhârî could not stay in Nishapûr. Imâm Bukhârî became afraid of what might happen, so he left there and went to Bukhârâ. (The full details of this are to be found in the Preface to *Fat'h ul Bârî* - the very famous commentary on *Sahîh Bukhârî* by ibn Hajr, who is regarded by the *ghair muqallidîn* as completely reliable - see *Muqaddamah* to *Fat'h ul Bârî* p.579) However, even there Muhammad bin Yahyâ did not leave him in peace. The details of this are recorded by historians like Shams ud Dîn Dhahabî, who was also a hâfiz of hadîth. In *Siyar A'lâm un Nubalâa* he writes that Dhahlî wrote complaints

against Imâm Bukhârî to the governor and to the scholars of Bukhârâ. The governor became enraged and made up his mind to take very harsh action against Imâm Bukhârî. However, the son of Abû Hafs Kabîr Hanafî, Muhammad bin Hafs was told about this, and he secretly took Imâm Bukhârî to a hospice in Bukhara. (See *Fawâ'id Yahîyah* p.19.)

The person who asked Imâm Bukhârî the fatwâ and then stirred up the people against him was himself one of the Ahl ul Hadîth of Nishapûr (*Muqaddamah* p.579). On the other hand, it was the son of Abû Hafs Kabîr (whom the speaker accuses of forcing Imâm Bukhârî to leave Bukhârâ) who risked his own life to save Imâm Bukhârî and bring him to the safety of a hospice in Bukhârâ. It would seem fairly clear that the motive behind misrepresenting this whole incident is to shift the blame for it from someone who is taken by the Ahl ul Hadîth as one of their predecessors and onto a Hanafî.

7. A Contradiction

On page 9 the speaker says: "It was in the 4th century that *taqlîd* was born." However, on page 12 he refers to a person who attacked Imâm Shâfi'î as being a follower of the Malikî school, and he also refers to the person he accuses of expelling Imâm Bukhârî from the city as a Hahafî. Then on p.13 he says, "This is a small example of the treatment of the As'hâb ul Hadîth by the propagators of Taqlîd."

Since Imâm Shâfi'î died in 204 A.H. this would mean

that *taqlîd* was already present in the second century. Clearly one or other of his statements is not quite right.

7 Ibn Taymîyah

Under the heading of "Persecution of the Ahl ul Hadîth", Ibn Taymîyah is described as "Imâm of the Ahl ul Hadîth," whereas Nawâb Siddîq Hasan Khân has referred to him as a follower (*muqallid*) of Imâm Ahmad bin Hanbal. (See Misk ul Makhtûm p.4.)

Similarly he has described Imâm M..... (?) as a leader of the Ahl ul Hadîth, whereas he was in fact Shâfi'î. This is made clear by Imâm Dhahabî in Tadhkirat ul Huffâdh on p. 280 of vol.1. He refers to Hâfidh Abd ul Ghanî Muqaddasî as "openly Ahl ul Hadîth" when in fact Imâm Dhahabî has clearly stated on p.160 of v. 4 of *Tadhkirah* that he was Hanbalî. Similarly he counts Sultân ul Awliyâa, Shaykh Nizâm ud Dîn Dehlawî as belonging to the Ash'hâb ul Hadîth (in his sense), whereas in the very place in Târîkh Farishtah that he has quoted as a reference, it is stated that an opponent of the Shaykh said to him that he was a "muqallid", and the Shaykh did not deny this. Also in Târîkh Farishtah on p.597 of v. 2 it says that he "had full recall and full expertise in the *Fiqh* of Abû Hanîfah, *Tafsîr, Hadîth, Usûl,* and *Kalâm.*"

Similarly it is not right for him to quote the name of Mawlânâ Ismâ'îl Shahîd, because he did not approve of leaving taqlîd. In Sirât ul Mustaqîm he writes, "*ammâ ittibâ' madhâhib 'arba'ah kih râ'ij dar tamâm ahl e islâm ast bihtar o khûb ast* - anyway, following the four

madhhabs, as is the universal practice of the people of Islâm, is right and proper."

Neither is it right to quote Mirzâ Madhhar Jân e Janân as being Ahl ul Hadîth. He was a strict Hanafî. Witn regard to the one or two points where his practice was contrary to that of Hanafî Fiqh, his Khalîfah Shâh Ghulâm 'Alî said, "*az intiqâl dar mas'alah juz'î khilâf madhhab lâzim namî âyad* - disagreement in a particular mas'alah does not amount to opposition to the madhhab." Mirzâ Sâhib has himself written the same thing (see Maktûb 12 p. 102). Mirzâ Sâhib was of the view that it was good (but not in any way obligatory) for the muqtadî in silent salât (dhuhr, asr) to read Sûrah Fâtihah behind the Imâm. However, he was so concerned about the necessity for following the Hanafî madhhab that he would himself act as imâm, thus avoiding where possible any occasion for acting contrary to the Hanafî madhhab." (*Maqâmât* p.119)

7 "Sectarian Conflict"

Then, under the heading of "sectarian conflict," the speaker talks about fights between the followers of the four different madhhabs.

In this matter the speaker is not paying the same attention to the state of affairs in his own house. It should not be forgotten how many sects and sectarian disputes have arisen out of the Ahl-e-Hadîth movement in century and a half during which it has been in existence.

During the time this speech was made, the Ahl-e-Hadîth in India were divided into two parties, one under the leadership of Maulwî Abd ul Wahâb Sadry Dehlawî, and the other under Maulwî Thanâ ullâh, to which the speaker belonged. The first party announced publicly that anyone following the other party would die the death of *jahilîyah*. Referring to this first party the speaker, on p.28 says:

> "After making a claim to *khilâfat*, and thus making himself a stateless monarch, he has given a fatwâ that whoever does not declare his allegiance to him and send his zakât to him in full will die the death of *jahilîyah*."

The first party also regards the second party as *mal'ûn* (under a curse). The speaker himself say that if anyone claims imâmat, but is not in a position to establish the Sharî'ah or to maintain it, then he is cursed. (p.28)

7 False Accusations

In this matter the speaker has also resorted to taking the mistakes of writers and presenting them as accusations. For example the writer of Hidâyah mistakenly says that Imâm Mâlik regarded *mutâ'* as permissible. He has presented this as the writer making a false accusation against Imâm Mâlik. *Al iyâdhu billâh*. If this kind of error is inexcusable, then why is it that in his translation of Ibn Shaybah's book *Kitâb ur Radd â'lâ Abî Hanîfah*, in those places where

the writer has misrepresented the view of Imâm Abû Hanîfah, he has not written that in this place Ibn Abî Shaybah has falsely accused Imâm Abû Hanîfah.

For example, Ibn Abî Shaybah says that according to Imâm Abû Hanîfah the time for Ishâ' extends only up to midnight. (Kitâb ur Radd p.30 and in his translation, p. 29.) In the speaker's terminology, this is a "patently false accusation." The actual view of the Imâm is that the time for Ishâ' extends up to *subh us sâdiq* (see *Sharah ul Ma' anî ul Âthâr* v.1 p.94,95.) Similarly, he says that according to IAH it is permissible for the mawâlî of the Banû Hâshim to eat from sadaqah (Kitâb ur Radd p.38 and in his translation, p. 35.) This is in fact not so. (see Tahâwî v.1, p. 301.) There are many other examples, but for the sake of keeping things short, they can be passed over.

The speaker has also presented many valid statements as false accusations. For example the writer of Hidâyah says that according to Imâm Shâfi'î, playing chess is not prohibited. This is quite true. However, the speaker does not seem to know the Shâfi'î view, and presents this as a false accusation. Allâmâ Ibn Hajr Makkî Shâfi'î in *zawâjir* writes:

(فمتى كان المعتمد على الفكر والحساب فلا وجه الا الحل كالشطرنج)

"So, as long as the objective is to develop the ability to think and calculate, then there is no reason for not permitting them, as for example chess." (v.2, p.168)

In the same way, he makes a great display of indignation at a footnote to Sunan Nisâ'î when there

is no cause for this. According to his translation, the footnote in question describes those Wahhâbîs "who consider it permissible to kill our men and take our women prisoner" as Khârijîs. Now, if the party he himself follows are not like this, then why should he take offence at this comment?

Also, if there are no *ghair muqallids* today who take this attitude, this does not in itself prove that at the time this footnote was written there were no Wahhâbîs who did take this attitude. So, until it is proved that there were no such people, this footnote cannot be called a false accusation. Is the speaker not aware of Muhammad bin Abd ul Wahhâb Najdî going to war against Muslims, and creating widespread bloodshed and misery? Is it then not possible that at that time there may also have been some Wahhâbîs like this in Hindustân?

7 The Ahl-e-Hadîth Maslak

After all these anecdotes, the speaker starts to explain the maslak of the Ahl ul Hadîth. He starts from the hadîth

(عليكم بسنتي وسنة الخلفاء الراشدين)

Which he translates as " Follow my practice and that of the Khulafâa-e-Râshidîn." (p.16) Further on he explains that the meaning of "the practice of the Khulafâa-e-Râshidîn" is that when they disagreed on some point, they acted according to the Hadîth of the Messenger *salallâhu alaihi wa sallam*. What he means to say is that the term Sunnnah applies only to the Messenger of Allâh *salallâhu alaihi wa sallam*, and

only his *sunnah* can be followed, and that the *sunnah* of the Khulafâ-e-Râshidîn is not *sunnah*, and that this hadîth does not contain an instruction to follow their *sunnah*. All it contains is an instruction to act on hadith, as was the practice of the Khulafâ-e-Râshidîn.

This gives rise to a question. Are we to understand that of the thousands and thousands of Sahâbah of the Messenger of Allâh *salallâhu alaihi wa sallam,* only four used act on the basis of Hadîth, and that none of the rest used to do so? Are we also to understand, *al iyâdhu billâh*, that the Messenger of Allâh *salallâhu alaihi wa sallam,* saw them in this light, and for this reason selected these four as people to be followed? If this is not what he means, then what does he consider to be the reason for selecting particularly these four Sahâbîs?

Then another question arises. On what basis does the speaker select "acting on hadîth" as being the meaning of "the practice of the Khulafâ-e-Râshidîn"? If he says that this is established from their lives, then the point still remains that there were a great many more things to be found in their lives. For example Sayyidinâ Abû Bak-r Siddîq *raziyallâhu 'anhu* said in relation to *kalâlah*

(ماخلا الوالد, والولد)

"In my opinion it means the person who has neither father or son living." This he said simply on the basis of his opinion, not any hadîth. Sayyidinâ 'Umar *raziyallâhu 'anhu* instructed Sharîh: "where you do not find an âyat of the Qur'ân or a hadith about a question,

then see what decision the pious make, and give your decision on that basis." He said that to resolve a question, analogy *(qiyâs)* with some other similar question could be used. (see *Hâfiz Ibn ul Qayyim - A'lâm ul Mûqi'în* - v.1, p. 29,30.) Again, Hazrrat Umar Fârûq did not take it on himself to contradict anything that Sayyidinâ Abû Bak-r Siddîq decided. Thus in the question of *kalâlah* he simply followed Sayyidinâ Abû Bak-r Siddîq. (*A'lâm ul Mûqi'în* - v.1, p. 73.) Indeed it was his practice that if he did not find a mas'alah in the Kitâb and Sunnah, and Sayyidinâ Abû Bakr had made a decision about it, then he considered that decision as binding on himself. (*A'lâm ul Mûqi'în* - v.1, p. 22.). Similarly Sayyidinâ Uthmân Ghanî ruled simply on the basis of his own opinion that a woman who is divorced by her husband when he is on his deathbed remains his heir. (*A'lâm ul Mûqi'în* - v.1, p. 76.) Sayyidinâ Alî ruled, simply on the basis of his own opinion that a woman slave who was *umm ul walad* could not be sold. (*A'lâm ul Mûqi'în* - v.1, p. 73.)

These examples demonstrate that it was the practice of the Khulafâa ur Râshidîn in masâ'il for which they did not find any âyat or hadîth, to give fatwâs and judgements on the basis of their own opinion. It was also their practice to decide on one issue on the basis of analogy with another issue. For further detail on this, see *A'lâm ul Mûqi'în* - v.1, pp. 21-80.

Then it was also the practice of the Khulafâa ur Râshidîn that together with following the practice of the Messenger of Allâh, they also regarded the practice of their predecessors as something to be

accepted and followed even where it was not the same as the practice of the Messenger *sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam*. Thus Sayyidinâ 'Umar *raziallâhu anhu* said,

ان استخلف فقد استخلف من هو خير مني يعني ابابكر وان اتر ككم

فقد تر ككم من هو خير مني رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم)

"If I appoint someone as my successor, I am doing what someone better than myself did, that is to say Abû Bak-r, and if I leave you to decide for yourselves, then I am doing what someone better than myself did, that is to say the Messenger of Allâh *sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam*." Imâm Nawwawî say the outcome of this is that to appoint a *khalîfah* (in the manner of Abû Bak-r) and to not appoint a *khalîfah* (in the manner of the Messenger of Allâh *sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam*.) are both legitimate. (Nawwawî - Sharh Muslim v.1, p.129)

Now, according to the speaker the practice of the Ahl ul Hadîth is:

"Compared to the *hadîth* of the Messenger, we do not regard the word of even the greatest of the great as having the weight of even the wing of a gnat." (*Khutbah-e-sadârat* p. 20)

However Sayyidinâ Umar who despite being one of the Khulafâa ur Râshidîn and following in the footsteps of the Messenger of Allâh, still regarded the decisions of Sayyidinâ Abû Bak-r Siddîq as something that was to be followed. Therefore, by leaving this practice of Sayyidinâ Umar, the Ahl e Hadîth are leaving the hadîth:

(عليكم بسنتي وسنة الخلفاء الراشدين)

"My sunnah and the sunnah of the *khulafâa ur râshidîn* are binding on you."

Furthermore according to the speaker's own statements, the *Khulafâa ur Râshidîn* regarded the practice of their predecessors as sunnah. Thus in one place he writes that Sayyidinâ Alî *raziyallâhu anhu* described the penalty for drinking wine that was set by Sayyidinâ Umar *raziyallâhu anhu* (i.e. 80 strokes) as sunnah, even though this was different to the practice during the time of the Messenger of Allâh. Similarly, by remaining silent on the matter, the third Khalîfah, Sayyidinâ Uthmân *raziyallâhu anhu* indicated his own approval of this. (see *Khutbah e Sadârat* p.18) However it appears that the Ahl e Hadith, far from regarding this as sunnah, do not consider it to be worth as much as the wing of a gnat. *Al iyâdhu billâh*.

After this, a point we need to consider is that when the practice of the Khulafâa e Râsidîn was that in every matter they gave precedence to the words and actions of the Messenger of Allâh sallallahu alaihi wa sallam, then it necessarily follows that there was no contradiction between their practice and the sunnah of the Messenger of Allâh. In this case, on the issue of istikhlâf (appointing a successor), what reason is there to regard the sunnah of the Messenger and the sunnah of the Khulafâa e Râshidîn as being incompatible or contradictory? (See *Khutbah e Sadârat* p.18)

Also, in the question of three *talâqs*, and the question of *tamattu'* in *hajj*, the Ahl e Hadîth do not say that in the *fatwâ* that Sayyidinâ 'Umar *raziyallâhu anhu* gave, he gave priority to the word and action of the Messenger of Allâh *sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam*. If they are to say that this was not always their practice, then this amounts to saying that in some matters they gave preference to their own statements and actions over the statements and actions of the Messenger *sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam*. Now to say such a thing about the *Khulafâa e Rashidîn* is a very serious attack on them.

Furthermore, by saying this, it necessarily follows that the Messenger of Allâh has given two contradictory orders. Together making with his own sunnah obligatory, he has made the sunnah of the Khulafâa e Râshidîn obligatory and, according to them, the latter in certain places contradicts the former. Whatever anyone may wish to say, we regard the person of the Messenger of Allâh as being above any such thing.

Then another point arises. In the statement

(عليكم بسنتي وسنة الخلفاء الراشدين)

"My sunnah and the sunnah of the Khulafâa ur Râshidîn are binding on you", there are no provisos. We then do not have the right to place our own provisos and limitations on it. To do this would amount to giving priority to one's own word over the word of the Messenger of Allâh.

However, on page 19 of his Khutbah e Sadârat the

speaker says: "Wherever the Khulafâa ur Râshidîn did something for political reasons, or because of some temporary need, it is not binding on us to follow that." So, on the one hand the Messenger of Allâh has givewn an unqualified instruction that we should follow his sunnah and the sunnah of the Khulafâa ur Râshidîn. Then on the other hand, the speaker is adding a proviso that if what they did was for some political reason or some temporary necessity, then we do not have to follow it. At the same time he is maintaining that we should act <u>only</u> on the basis of what is clearly stated in the Qur'ân and the Hadîth.

Another question arises. If the Khulafâa ur Rashidîn did something for some "political reason or temporary necessity", then why should that mean that we not have to follow it? Was it then contrary to the word or action of the Messenger sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam? If it was, then this would mean that it was not their practice to act on the basis of Hadîth, and that to give priority to the word and action of the Messenger was not their way. Alternatively, if it as not contrary to this, then it necessarily follows that we are bound to follow them.

The person most frequently cited by the Jamâ'at Ahl e Hadîth as an authority, and as representing their viewpoint, is Hafiz Ibn Qayyim. It is instructive to see what he has said about this hadîth. In *A'lâm ul Mûqi'în* on p. 226, he writes:

فقرن سنة خلفائة بسنته وامر یاتباعها کما امر یاتباع سنته وبالغ

فی الامر بها حتی امر بان یعض علیها بالنواجذ وهذا یتناول ما افتوا به

وسنوه للامة وان لم یتقدم من نبیهم فیه شئ والا کان ذلک سنته

"The Messenger of Allâh has referred to the sunnah of the Khulafâa ur Râshidîn along with his own sunnah, and has instructed that it should be followed in the same way as his own sunnah, and in this has even gone so far as to use the expression of holding on to it with the back teeth. This sunnah of the Khulafâa includes their fatwâs and those practices which they established for the Ummah, even where there is no prior instruction from the Messenger of Allâh concerning them; otherwise whatever they did simply comes under the sunnah of the Messenger sallallâhu alsihi wa sallam himself."

7 Qiyâs and Ijmâ'

Under this heading the speaker says, "We do not reject *qiyâs* and *ijmâ'*......What we say is that the hadîth of the Messenger should be the basis of analogy......this rule is something that people have completely abandoned." (p.21)

This is another piece of boldly presented misinformation. Since when has any *hanafî* or *muqallid* abandoned this principle? Where has anyone said that the hadîth of the Messenger should not be made the basis of analogy? In the Hanâfî books of Usûl (principles) it is clearly stated that the only qiyâs that

is acceptable is that which is based on the Qurâ'n and Sunnah.

هو القياس المستنبط من هذه الاصول الثلاثه

(*Nûr ul Anwâr* p.4)

After this there remains the issue of *haml un nadhîr 'alan nadhîr*. (   ) This does not contradict the principle of making the hadîth the basis of analogy, nor is it something whose validity can be denied. Imâm (Mzny), the pupil of Imâm Shâfi'î, has stated:

الفقها ء من عصر رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) الى يومنا وهلم جراً استعملوا المقاييس فى الفقه فى جميع الاحكام فى امر دينهم

(قال) واجمعوا ان نظيرالحق حق ونظير الباطل باطل

"From the time of the Messenger of Allâh right up to today the fuqahâa have made use of qiyâs in all the *ahkâm* of religion........and they agree unanimously that the nadhîr (equivalent) of *haqq* is *haqq* and the *nadhîr* of *bâtil* is *bâtil*." (A'lâm ul Mûqinîn v.1 p. 74)

Consider this point. In the light of the hadîth, in an exchange of barley for barley, no difference in amount is permitted. Now if someone applies the same thing to millet, will this not be *haml un nadhîr 'alan nadhîr*? If it is, and it most certainly is, then where is the contradiction between *haml un nadhîr 'alan nadhîr* and making the hadîth the basis of analogy?

On this topic the speaker has quoted Shâh Waliyullâh Dehlawî. However it is clear from the way that they

are quoted that the speaker had not in fact taken the trouble to understand what Shâh Waliyullâh was actually saying.

Shortly before quoting the examples of *haml un nadhîr 'alan nadhîr* that the speaker quotes, Shâh Waliyullâh explains that Hanafî Fiqh is not based on the academic proofs that are presented in *Hidâyah* and other similar books. These arguments are given simply for the purpose of intellectual stimulation. (*Hujjatullâh il Bâlighah* p.128)

Thus, without taking any account of the context, the speaker has treated these arguments as being their basis in Fiqh of the *masâ'il* in question, and then set about raising objections to them. Even then, carried away by the heat of his arguments he does not even take care to stick to the truth. On the contrary, he constructs a mas'alah of his own and then attributes it to the Hanafîyah.

A) On page 12 he says:

"A person hires a woman for the purpose of fornication. After this the woman takes the sum agreed. In effect, this is an invalid hire agreement, and the basis of the hire agreement is a prohibited action. However a rule has been made: "A fair wage is fair."....therefore it is legitimate for that woman to take the wage."

Readers should know that this is blatant false accusation and false attribution. All of our *fuqahâa* have written that if a woman is hired for fornication, then the wage she takes for this is *harâm*. Allâmah Ainî Hanafî writes in Sharh Bukhârî:

لا تحل لانه ثمن عن محرم وقد حرم الله الزنا وهذا مجمع

على تحريمه لا خلاف بين المسلمين

"Any wages for fornication is not legitimate, because it is given in return for an action that is prohibited. Allâh Almighty has prohibited fornication. There is ijmâ' on this, and no one at all among Muslims has disputed this." (v.5 p.611)

Similarly Allâmah Anwar Shâh Kashmîrî writes in his commentary on Tirmidhî concerning the wage of a harlot that it is

حرام عند الكل

"harâm according to all."(p.402)

In short, for the speaker to say:

"The Hanafîs, on the basis of *"ajr ul mithl tayyib"* have said that the wages of a harlot are halâl, even though it is clear from the hadîth

مهر البغي خبيث

'the mahr of a harlot is harâm'
that it is harâm."

is a plain lie. The Hanafîs have also said that it is harâm, and have said so on the basis of that same

hadîth. In both of the books referred to above, under the heading of this hadîth, the wage of a harlot has been declared harâm. Then, in Badâ'î we find

ولا تجوز اجارة الإماء للزنا لأنها إجارة على المعصية (الى قوله)

روى عن رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم) انه نهى عن مهر البغي وهو

اجر الزانية على الزنا

"The hiring of slave girls for fornication is not permissible, because it is payment for sin...........it is reported that the Messenger of Allâh has prohibited the mahr of a harlot, and the mahr of a harlot is a term for the wages of fornication."

This should be enough to make clear that what the speaker has said is less than honest. Even Maulwî Abd ur Rahmân Mubârakpûrî (of the Ahl e Hadîth) has also had to admit that:

هو مجمع على تحريمه

"on this question there is ijmâ' of the whole *ummah*. There has not been any disagreement." (Sharh Tirmidhî)

On this issue the speaker has also given Allâmah Shâmî as a reference. Again, this is patent false attribution. In Shâmî there is no mention whatsoever of "Paying a woman a wage for fornication".

Looking to Their Own House

It is however interesting to note that Hâfiz Abdullâh Sâhib Ghâzî, *ahl e hadîth*, has written:

"A prostitute has earned money through fornication, and then repented of it. In this case her money becomes legitimate and pure, both for herself and for all Muslims." (Fatâwâ Hâfiz Abdullâh Sâhib Gâzîpûrî, 23 Rabî' ul Âkhir 1329, quoted in Qata'ul Watîn)

B) The speaker quotes this mas'alah:

"If an imâm who is *musâfir* (on journey) does not make *qasr*, but performs the whole *salât*, then the *salât* of *Muqtadîs* who are *muqîm* (not on journey) is not valid, because for the last two *rak'ats* the *salât* of the imâm was *nafal*."

Up to this point what he writes is correct. However the reasoning on which he claims this is based - "the strong cannot be based on the weak", seems to be something he has made up for himself. He has not quoted any book of Hanafî Fiqh as a reference.

Even if he did quote some reference, it would not make any difference, because, as Shâh Waliyullâh has stated, Hanafî Fiqh is not founded on academic proofs of the kind quoted in Hidâyah and so on.

In actual fact the basis the reason for the mutaqadîs salât in the above instance being invalid is that the salât of a person performing his faraz salât is not valid behind an imâm who is making nafal salât. This is established from precisely the hadîth that the speaker quotes. However, he has also quoted part of this hadîth.

The full incident is as follows. Maâ'z raziyallayu anhu used to join in 'Ishâ salât behind the Messenger of Allâh sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam, and then go to his own quarter and lead the 'Ishâ salât there. He used to read very long rak'ats. When complaints about this were made in the court of the Messenger sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam, he said to him

اما ان تصلي معي واما ان تخفف على قومك

"You should either make your salât with me, or, if you make it with your people, then shorten your rak'ats." Hâfiz Ibn Taymîyah, who the speaker has called the "imâm of the Ahl e Hadîth", writes that this hadîth proves that it is not valid for a person to make his farz salât behind an imâm who is making nafl,

لا نه يدل على انه اذا صلى معه امتنعت إمامته

"because it (the hadîth) shows that if he (Ma'âz raziyallu anhu) made his salât behind him (the Messenger of Allâh sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam), then he would not be able to act as imâm." (See Shâmî v. 1 p. 407)

So it established from this that a person performing farz salât cannot follow an imâm who is making nafl. Then, in the previous mas'alah, for a musâfir the last two rak'ats are nafl, and for the person following him they are farz. Therefore, in the light of this hadîth of Ma'âz, the salât of the *muqtadî* (the person following) will not be valid.

In quoting this hadîth the speaker has not quoted it in full, and then then also made some additions to it. He

then presents it, saying that the Hanafî scholars, contrary to this hadith, have derived their ruling from a principle of their own making. In point of fact, the situation is exactly the opposite. In precisely the way that the accepted imâm of the Ahl e Hadith has explained, the Hanafî scholars have based their ruling on this very hadîth.

In quoting this hadîth, the speaker has said that Ma'âz raziyallâhu anhu "used to make his farz 'Ishâ with the Messenger of Allâh sallallâhu 'alaihi wa sallam." The word farz he has himself added. Hâfidh ibn Taymîyah has explained at this point,

فعلم ان الذی کان یصلیه مع النبی صلی اللہ علیه وسلم نفل

"Know that the salât that he was making with the Messenger of Allâh sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam was nafl"

Imâm Qutrubî, whom the speaker also counts as being of the "Ahl ul Hadîth," has also said the same thing. (see Shâmî v.1 p. 407)

(A person can join a jamât and pray with the nîyah of nafl, either after he has already made his faraz, or before making his faraz elsewhere. The latter is what Harat Maâ'z raziyallâhu anhu was in fact doing. The Messenger of Allâh told him to either make his farz with him i.e. not act as imâm in his local masjid, or, if he did act as imâm, to shorten his rak'ats. In short, in accordance with his own priciple of referring directly to hadîth, the speaker quoted this hadîth, but at the same time completely misunderstood its meaning.)

B) The third example the speaker gives is this:

“A person reads his fajr salât so late that after the first rak’at the sun rises, and he then reads the second rak’at. His salât becomes invalid.”(p. 22)

This mas’alah is also in itself correct. However, the reasoning he gives is wrong. The Hanafî jurists have most certainly not arrived at this verdict on the basis of a principle that “the deficient cannot be added to the complete.” They have said that something whose completion is obligatory cannot be fulfilled by something that is deficient. Furthermore, this point, as Shâh Waliyullâh has made clear, is simply intellectualisation. It is not the actual basis of the mas’alah. On the contrary, this mas’alah is also based on a hadîth.

From the hadîth that the speaker has quoted it would appear that salât performed like this at the time of the rising of the sun is still valid. However there are a large number of other hadîth in which making the salât at the time of sunrise has been prohibited.Now only two alternatives remain - either to give priority to the first hadîth or to give priority to the others. So, Imâm Shâfi’î, on the basis of his own understanding and ijtihâd, has given priority to the first. Imâm Abu Hanîfah, on the basis of his understanding and *ijtihâd*, has given priority to the second. He has therefore concluded that salât made in this way is not valid. Anyway, both Imâm Shâfi’î and Imâm Abu Haîfah have based their decisions only on hadîth. For further detail see *Sharh Ma’ânî ul Âthâr* v.1, p.232-234).

7 "No Ijmâ' Other Than the Ijmâ' of the Sahâbah"

After the subject of *Qiyâs*, what the speaker has said about *Ijmâ'* is as follows:

"Essentially the *ijmâ'* that is authoritative is the *ijmâ'* of the *sahâbah kirâm*." (p.24)

Readers should note this point. What he has said is that the *ijmâ'* of the *tâbi'în*, the *taba' tâbi'în*, or other *mujtahidîn* has no authority. Only the *ijmâ'* of the *sahâbah kirâm* is authoritative. In short, he does not accept any *ijmâ'* other than that of the *sahâbah*.

7 An Answer to Objections

Finally it has occurred to the speaker that the passages which he has quoted to establish the existence of "Ahl ul Hadîth," for the most part refer to compilers of hadîth. To strengthen his own interpretation of the term, he makes the following statement:

"In the same way, in the passages in the text of Usûl ud Dîn, and those referring to Imâm Shâfi'î and Imâm Ahmad, the term 'madhhab of the Ahl ul Hadîth' is clearly used."

What he means to say is that the term Ahl ul Hadîth does not only mean a complier of Hadîth, but also refers to a madhhab called Ahl ul Hadîth. So clearly he does not deny that the term Ahl ul Hadîth is used to refer to those who compile hadîth. What then remains is the question of whether there was any madhhab called Ahl ul Hadîth, and then the validity of

his reference to Usûl ud Dîn.

As far as this reference is concerned, the earlier discussion of these passages will have made it quite clear that they in no way support his interpretation.

Then come the passages referring to Imâm Shâfi'î and Imâm Ahmad. On this point a question arises. If both these Imâms were Ahl ul Hadîth, then the people who follow their madhab and accept their *madhhab* are also Ahl ul Hadîth. In this case why does the speaker exclude them from the Ahl ul Hadîth? Furthermore, if their *madhhab* is already Ahl ul Hadîth, then what need is there to establish another *madhhab*? Establishing a *madhhab* distinct from the madhhab of these two personages can only mean one of two things. Either they were not Ahl ul Hadîth, or else the *madhhab* of the speaker is not Ahl ul Hadîth.

After this he quotes a passage from Qâzî Ayyâz. However, rather than strengthening his case it damages it. He states that what Imâm Ahmad has said referring to the firqah nâjîyah means that the *firqah nâjîyah* is the *ahl us sunnah wal jamâ'ah* - that is to say, by the phrase "ahl ul hadîth" Imâm Ahmad means the *ahl us sunnah wal jamâ'ah*. Therefore what the speaker represents on p.7&8 - that the passages he quotes here refer specifically to what he regards as the "Ahl ul Hadîth" - is simply not correct. They refer to the whole *ahl us sunnah wal jamâ'ah*.

Someone may object that after the phrase "the ahl us sunnah wal jamâ'ah", Qâzî Ayyâz has written

ومن يعتقد مذهب اهل الحديث

"and those follow the way of the ahl ul hadîth". Now the answer to this is that if the word "and" here is to be read as *'atf mughâ'ir 'alal mughâ'ar*, (i.e. joining two things that are different to each other) then the speaker should announce publicly that the *ahl ul hadîth* and those who follow them are not part of the *ahl us sunnah wal jamâ'ah*. However, if he is not willing to make this announcement, then he will have to accept that here the "and" is *'atf tafsîrî*, (i.e. adding more information about the previous thing) and that the *ma'tûf* and the *ma'tûf ilaihi* (the thing that is added and the thing to which it is added) both refer to the same group of people, and that is the group of the *ahl us sunnah wa'l jamâ'ah*.

After this he says that

"Hâfiz Nawwawî Shâfiî'......in his *Sharh Muslim* in several places refers to five different madhhabs, saying that 'in our Shâfi'î madhhab this is like this', 'in the Mâlikî madhhab like this', 'in the Hanafî madhhab like this', 'in the Hanbalî madhhab like this,' and then separately states the madhhab of the Ahl ul Hadîth. - see v.1, p73, and v.2 p.32."
Then, right next to what he has said here, he says:

"Those people who practice *qirâ'at* behind the *imâm* and *refa' yadain* before *rukû'* have always been called *ahl ul hadîth*." (p.24,25)

It is clear that Imâm Shâfi'î and his followers, and (in

the opinion of those who refer to themselves Ahl e Hadîth*), Imâm Ahmad and his followers, all practiced on *qirâ'at khalfal imâm* and *rafa' yadain 'indal ruk'û*. Therefore they were all Ahl ul Hadîth.

[*See Molwî Muhammad Alî Sâhib Mi'awî's booklet *Al Qawlu Muhallan bi Kulli Zain* and Mawlânâ Abd ur Rahmân Mubârakpûrî's booklet *Tahqîq ul Kalâm* part1]

The speaker then needs to explain why it is that Hâfidh Nawwawî has spoken of "the ahl ul hadîth" as something distinct from both of them.

Indeed in the pages of *Sharah Muslim* referred to above Hâfidh Nawwawî has himself referred to the "ahl ul hadîth" as distinct from Imâm Ahmad, Imâm Shâfi'î, Imâm Thawrî, and Imâm Mâlik. From this it is clear that these personages were not ahl ul hadîth. It therefore follows inescapably that when the speaker refers to them on p.6 and 7 as being ahl ul hadîth, he is mistaken.

7 An Answer to Objections turns into a Confirmation of Objections

If the speaker things carefully he will see that instead of answering objections he has in fact confirmed them because

firstly, he cannot deny that the term Ahl ul Hadîth is used to refer to those who transmit Hadîth.

secondly, in quoting the passage from Qâdî Ayyâz he

has established that the term Ahl ul Hadîth is also used in the sense of Ahl us Sunnah wal Jamâ'ah.

thirdly, having said that "the term *ahl ul hadîth* has always been used to refer to all those who practice on *qirâ'at khalfal imâm* and *rafa' yadain 'indal ruk'û*", he has established, at the very least, that every Shâfi'î can be called *ahl ul hadîth*.

Therefore, to establish the existence of what he calls the Ahl ul Hadîth, he still has to produce valid evidence to show that in each of the passages he has quoted, the term ahl ul hadîth does not have one of these three meanings.

7 Who is Meant By "Ahl e Hadîth"?

Basically these days the term Ahl ul Hadîth is used to refer to those people who, in spite of simply being ordinary individuals (i.e. do not have the qualifications to be a *mujtahid*), do not accept the need to follow one of the Imâms. What Maulânâ Habîb ur Rahmân is saying is that this use of the term is entirely novel, and that such Ahl ul Hadîth have never existed until very recent times.

The persons of earlier times whom that the speaker has presented as being Ahl ul Hadîth were either *ahl ul hadîth* in the sense of transmitting hadîth or specialising in the study and teaching of hadîth, or *ahl ul hadîth* in the sense of following the Shâfi'î or Mâlikî madhhab,or *ahl ul hadîth* in the sense of being *ahl us sunnah wal jamâ'ah*. The term ahl ul hadîth is

used in these three senses. This we have established above. Indeed it is also established from the speaker's own explanations. Thus his efforts to establish his point have so far produced no result.

It still remains for him to produce from the books of the *mutaqaddimîn* (the scholars of the early period) any passage in which an *'âmmî ghair muqallid* (an unqualified person who does not follow any imâm) is referred to as *ahl ul hadîth*.

وهذا آخر الكلام والحمد لله رب العالمين والصلوٰة والسلام على رسوله

النبى الامين وآله وصحبه واتباعه الى يوم الدين

And that concludes what we had to say, and all praise is for Allâh. Lord of All the Worlds, and his mercy and peace remain always on His Messenger, the Trusted, the Teller of Truth, and on his Household, and his Companions, and his followers until the Day of Reckoning.

(Original booklet written Dhi'l Hijjah 1362 A.H. - Dec 1943 G.C.)

ولله الحمد

Appendix

Summary of a lecture given by Maulânâ Muhammad Abd us Shukûr

The day before Maulânâ Habîb ur Rahmân's talk, Maulânâ Muhammad Abd us Shukûr had given a talk on the same issue. Because of his ill-health this talk was very short, but at the same time very illuminating. What he said was afterwards misrepresented by his opponents, so M. Habîb ur Rahmân included a brief summary of what he actually said as a conclusion to the written text of his own talk.

1) The speaker started by quoting this âyat of the Holy Qur'ân:

{تتمه}

الذين ان مكنهم فى الارض اقاموا الصلوٰة واتوا الزكوٰة

وامروا بالمعروف ونهوا عن المنكر ولله عاقبة الامور

those who,
if We establish their position in the land,
will establish the Salât, and give the Zakât,
and order what is good,
and prohibit what is wrong,
and Allâh Almighty knows
the outcome of all affairs.

or alternatively
the outcome of all affairs rests with Allâh.

2) After reciting this âyat he said that the subject of his talk would be the status of the Sahâbah and the

importance of the Salât, even though the purpose of the gathering was to answer the objections raised by *ghair muqallidîn* against the leading scholars of the Hanafî School. Unfortunately, as the organisers of this Hanafî Conference had not given him any information about them, he did not know what these objections were. Indeed, he had not received even the text of the Khutbah Sadârat of the Ahl e Hadîth Conference. Therefore he was not in a position to give any kind of detailed talk on that subject.

2) In this âyat, the listener can hear for himself how well and how fittingly the merits of the sahâbah kirâm, and particularly of the muhâjirîn have been described. In particular he shed light on a rather fine point: Why is it that the merits and the achievements of the sahâbah, and particularly of the muhâjirîn and ansâr have been spoken of with such attention that, from looking at the pages of the Holy Qur'ân it almost seems as if one major objective of the revelation of the Holy Qur'ân was to establish in the hearts of muslims a firmly grounded conviction of the saintliness, purity, and elevated standing of the muhâjirîn and ansâr?

He then explained this point so well in the light of several âyât of the Holy Qur'ân, that people's hearts spontaneously began to exclaim

{لله در کم وعلیه اجر کم}

lillâhi darrakum wa 'alaihi ajrakum. "Allâh is the one who enabled you to do this, and he is the one who will reward you for it."

After that, the way in which he explained the benefits and the importance of the Salât was again an unexpected delight for all muslims.

2) Explaining the *fadîlat* (merits) of the *muhâjirîn*

ridwânullâhi alaihim from this âyat, he said that had *'ismat* (sinlessness) not been a exclusive characteristic of *nabuwwat* (prophethood), then this âyat would certainly have provided good grounds for asserting that the *muhâjirîn* were *ma'sûm* (sinless) - especially with regard to those who succeeded to the office of *khilâfat*, during the time of that *khilâfat*. After this, by way of confirmation, he read a few passages of the peerless book of Shâh Walîyullâh *muhaddith* Dehlawî, *"Izâlat ul Khafâ"*, among them being the following passage:

Ba az mafhûm "aqâmû, âtû, wa amarû wa nahaw" ânast kih har cheh az mumakkinîn dar ayyâm-i-tamkîn-e-iyshân aziyn abwâb đhâhir shawad hamah mu'tadd bihi khwâhad bûd shar'an.

Included in the meaning of *"aqâmû, âtû, wa amarû wa nahaw"* is that, during the period of their *tamkîn*, whatever actions the *mumakkinîn* will do that come under these headings, will all be dependable in terms of *sharî'ah*.

As well as this, he read out the passage in which Shaikh Walîyullâh *muhaddith* Dehlawî describes the *fađilat* of the *muhâjirîn* that is being defined by this Qurânic âyat about the *muhâjirîn* as being "the shade of *'ismat..*" (i.e. the shade of the *ismat* of the Messenger sallallâhu alaihi wa sallam, rather than *ismat* itself)

2) In the connection with of this he referred to the twenty rak'ats of tarâwîh. He said that the clear logical consequence of abandoning taqlîd is that those who do so will have to deny the fađîlat of the *muhâjirîn* which is established from this qurânic âyat. The *ghair muqallidîn* say that the twenty *rak'ât* of *tarâwîh* is a *bid'ah* (innovation), even though during the time of the *khilâfat* of 'Umar *rađiallâhu 'anhu* the twenty rak'ats of *tarâwîh* was organised on a regular basis, and this was done was by his order, or at the very least, took place with his full knowledge. The ghair muqallidîn also accept that he knowing about it. So, if this

thing was a *bid'ah* and was undesirable, then it is not possible that Umar *raḋiyallâhu 'anhu*, who in the time of his *tamkîn*, was the best of this very *jamâ'ah* of *muhajirîn*, should not stop this undesirable practice, and instead, let it continue.

Then, in the course of this, he spoke of *taqlîd* as being a *sunnah mutawâtirah*, pointing out its immense benefits, and shed some light on the damage that comes from abandoning *taqlîd*. He also said that nearly twenty years previously, in Darbhangah, he gave a talk on this same âyat, and in the course of it, the topic of tarâwîh also came up, although here, from beginning to end, the actual talk was in reply to the *rawâfiḋ (rawâfiḋ* means Shî'ah). However, some *ghair muqallidîn* were present at the talk. They then attributed some completely false and unfounded statements to me, which they printed in the *ahl e hadîth* newspapers, and I had to answer in *"an Najm"*. It is quite possible that on this occasion also, they will resort to the same kind of misrepresentation.

What he said about *tarawîh* was in itself a magnificent lecture. That the twenty *rak'ats* of *tarâwîh* was *sunnah*, and that the people who say that twenty *rak'ats* is a *bid'ah* do not actually understand what is *sunnah*, was all made clear as daylight. In reference to this, he also gave a quotation from *"Minhâj us Sunnah"* by *Shaykh ul Islâm* Allâmah ibn Taymiyyah, where he sets out accurately researched answers to the objection of the leading Imâm by the Shî'ah Shaikh H-l-y that *tarâwîh* is a *bid'ah* and that *'Umar raḋiyallâhu 'anhu* was the originator of this bid'ah.

That is a summary of Maulânâ's talk. Throughout the whole talk, not a single harsh word was used. There was nothing that any person could take as grounds for complaint. This particular characteristic of both his speaking and his writing is something that is acknowledged today all over India.

Tahqîq Ahl ul Hadîth

Investigating the Credentials of the

" Ahl ul Hadîth "

by

Maulânâ Habîb ur Rahmân Âzamî

**" This learning is your religion
Take care from whom you
learn it "**

ZAM ZAM PUBLISHERS
2, Shah Zeb Centre, Near Muqadas Masjid,
Urdu Bazar, Karachi. Pakistan. Post Code: 74200
Phone (021) 7760374, Tel/Fax: (021) 7725673,
Email : zamzam@sat.net.pk

Tahqîq Ahl ul Hadîth

By Maulânâ Habîb ur Rahmân Azamî
Translated by: Abd ur Rahmân O'Beirne

Sole Distributors:
Al Farooq International
1a Atkinson Street
Leicester
LE5 3QA
United Kingdom
Tel: 00-44-0116 253 7640
Fax: 00-44-0116 262 8655
E-Mail: alfarooq@onetel.net.uk

ZAM ZAM PUBLISHER
KARACHI-PAKISTAN
0092 - 21 - 7725673

The Author

Maulânâ Habîb ur Rahmân 'Azamî was a very well known and reputable scholar of the Indian subcontinent, whose reputation extended well beyond its boundaries into the Arab world. He was born in 1319 A.H. and passed away in 1413 A.H. (1992). He was an acknowledged authority on Tafsîr, Fiqh, and Hadîth.

Maulânâ Habîb ur Rahmân was born in the town of Mau Nath Bhanjan in the district of Azamgarh (U.P.) India. His whole life was spent in study and teaching. Like the great scholars of the past, he led a very simple and unpretentious life, spending most of his life in his home town, and teaching Hadîth literature to students from all over the world. There he founded a number of institutions, among them Madrasah Mirqât ul 'Ulûm, Jâmi'ah Miftâh ul 'Ulûm, and the Islâmic Institute for Higher Studies.

He studied under a number of prominent Ulamâa of the last century, including Allâmah Anwar Shâh Kashmîrî, Muftî 'Azîz ur Rahmân Deobandî, and Maulânâ 'Abd ul Ghaffâr, the disciple of Maulânâ Rashîd Ahmâd Gangohî. Many students have benefited from his learning, one of whom was Maulânâ Manzûr Nu'mânî. Several prominent scholars of the Arab world have also been given 'ijâzah by him. They include Shaikh Abdul Fattâh Abu Ghuddah, Shaikh Ismâ'îl al Ansârî (Dar ul Iftâ Riyâd) Shaikh Hammâd al Ansârî (Islâmic University Madînah) Shaikh Subhî Sâmarrâ'î (Baghdâd), Dr 'Abd us Sattâr Abû Ghuddah (Kuwait), and Dr Bashshâr 'Awad Ma'rûf (Baghdâd).

This Book

This book explains the meaning of the term "Ahl ul Hadîth." This term is used in many books dating from different periods. At present there are certain parties who claim that it refers to people who do not follow any of the four schools of fiqh, and derive legal judgements directly from Hadîth. Basically the purpose behind this claim is to establish that this view was to be found among scholars of Islam since the earliest times.

The author, who has spent his whole life teaching Hadîth, and is very familiar with the literature referring to it, shows that this is a complete misrepresentation of the facts. This term has only been used in this sense within the last two centuries, since the start of the movement which at present uses this name. Prior to that, the term was used in several different senses, but never in this sense.

This is an important issue. The Muslim world is not going to easily accept the views of any group unless they have at least some claim to be able to trace their origins to the early days of Islam. If it is not able to do so, then this means that their teachings are an innovation, and "every innovation is error and every error…." (al Hadîth). In these times, when people are greatly inclined to take their religion from rumour among their fellows, rather than lessons by teachers, and when fellowship has taken the place of study, it is very easy to circulate confused ideas and misrepresentations. This translation of a booklet by a very reputable teacher should be useful for dispelling one misrepresentation that has now become quite widespread.

He has written several works on Hadîth. One of them is a critique of the works of Shaikh Ahmad Muhammad Shâkir, a well-known recent scholar of Hadîth. He has also edited and brought out several manuscripts of Hadîth from private collections. Among them are *Al Musannaf* of Imâm Abd ur Razzâq (11 vols); *Musnad al Humaidî* (2 vols); the *Sunan* of Sa'îd ibn Mansûr; *Intiqâ' at Tarhîb* by ibn Hajar; *Al Matâlib al 'Aliyah bi Zawâ'id al Masânid ath Thamâniyah* by Ibn Hajar (4 vols); the *Kashf al Astâr 'an Zawâ'id Musnad al Bazzâr* of Haithamî; *Al Musannaf* by ibn Abî Shaibah; *Kitâb ath Thiqât* by ibn Shâhîn, and *Fat'h al Mughîth* by Imâm Sakhâwî.

His own writings include:

- *Al Hâwî li Rijâl at Tahâwî* which traces the rijâl (personalities) mentioned in Imâm Tahâwî's *Ma'ânî al 'Athâr* and *Mushkil al Áthâr.*
  Al Ithâfah as Saîyah bi Dhikri Muhaddithî al Hanafîyah
  These two works have still to be published.
  Published works include:
- *Nusrat al Hadîth* on the indispensibility of the Hadîth, and refuting the arguments of those who try to reject the Hadîth
- *A'yân al Hujjâj* listing the famous Ulamâa who have performed Hajj and Ziyârah
- *Rak'at at Tarâwîh*
- *Shâri' Haqîqî*
- *Dastkâr Ahl e Sharf* establishing that the real criteria for nobility is lawful earning in accordance with the Sharî'ah, and not the standards of nobility prescribed by the colonial powers or the traditional Muslim aristocracy.